1 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

STEVEN J. SCHIEFFER,	
Plaintiff,	Case No. 2:16-cv-00672-APG-NJK
vs.	ORDER
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)) (Docket No. 8)
Defendant.	
)

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to proceed *sua sponte*. Docket No. 8. Defendant United States filed a response. Docket No. 12. No reply was filed. *See* Docket. The Court finds this matter properly resolved without oral argument. *See* LR 78-1.

Plaintiff asks the Court to waive the Federal Rules of Civil Procedural in this matter. Docket No. 8 at 1. Plaintiff bases this request on the fact that he is proceeding *pro se* and has been unable to obtain counsel. *Id.* at 1-2. Plaintiff also appears to ask the Court to find that the United States waived service. *Id.* at 1.

Pro se litigants are bound by the rules of procedure – both the federal rules and the Court's local rules. *See Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995); *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 568 (9th Cir. 1987). Plaintiff misconstrues LR 1.4. A federal district court, however, "can refuse to apply a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure in a civil case 'only if the Advisory Committee, [the Supreme] Court, and Congress erred in their prima facie judgment that the Rule in question transgresses neither the terms of the Enabling Act nor constitutional restrictions." *Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA*, 317 F.3d 1097, 1103 (9th Cir. 2003) (alterations in original).

Case 2:16-cv-00672-APG-NJK Document 26 Filed 07/01/16 Page 2 of 2

Plaintiff fails to make this showing. Further, Plaintiff's concerns are adequately addressed by
the Ninth Circuit's directive to liberally construe the filings of <i>pro se</i> litigants. <i>See Hebbe v. Pliler</i> , 627
F.3d 338, 342 (9th Cir. 2010). Thus, despite proceeding <i>pro se</i> , Plaintiff is bound by the Federal Rules
of Civil Procedure. See Ghazali, 46 F.3d at 54.
Additionally, Plaintiff's request regarding waiver appears to be moot. The United States has
appeared in the instant case, so any issue regarding waiver of service is moot.
Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion to proceed sua sponte, Docket No. 8, is hereby DENIED .
IT IS SO ORDERED.

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge